

[REDACTED]


Pursuant to 28 U.S.C Section 1746, I, [REDACTED], make the following declaration.

1. I am over the age of 21 years and am a resident of Monroe County, Florida.
2. I am under no legal disability that would prevent me from giving this declaration.
3. I hold a Bachelor of Science degree in Mathematics and a Master of Science degree in Statistics.
4. For thirty years, I have conducted statistical data analysis for companies in various industries, including aerospace, consumer packaged goods, disease detection and tracking, and fraud detection.
5. From November 13th, 2020 through November 28th, 2020, I conducted in-depth statistical analysis of publicly available data on the 2020 U.S. Presidential Election. This data included vote counts for each county in the United States, U.S. Census data, and type of voting machine data provided by the U.S. Election Assistance Committee.
6. The analysis yielded several “red flags” concerning the percentage of votes won by candidate Biden in counties using voting machines provided by Dominion Voting Systems. These red flags occurred in several States in the country, including Wisconsin.
7. I began by using Chi-Squared Automatic Interaction Detection (CHAID), which treats the data in an agnostic way—that is, it imposes no parametric assumptions that could otherwise introduce bias. Here, I posed the following question: “Do any voting machine

types appear to have unusual results?” The answer provided by the statistical technique/algorithm was that machines from Dominion Voting Systems (Dominion) produced abnormal results.

8. Subsequent graphical and statistical analysis shows the unusual pattern involving machines from Dominion occurs in at least 100 counties and multiple States, including Wisconsin.
9. The results from most, if not all counties using the Dominion machines is three to five point six percentage points higher in favor of candidate Biden than the results should be. This pattern is seen easily in graphical form when the results from “Dominion” counties are overlaid against results from “non-Dominion” counties. The results from “Dominion” counties do not match the results from the rest of the counties in the United States. The results are certainly statistically significant, with a p-value of < 0.00004 . This translates into a statistical impossibility that something unusual involving Dominion machines is *not* occurring. This pattern appears in multiple States, including Wisconsin, and the margin of votes implied by the unusual activity would easily sway the election results.
10. The following graph shows the pattern. The large red dots are counties in Wisconsin that use Dominion voting machines. Almost all of them are above the blue prediction line, when in normal situations approximately half of them would be below the prediction line (as evidence by approximately half the counties in the U.S. (blue dots) that are below the blue centerline). The p-value of statistical analysis regarding the centerline for the red dots (Wisconsin counties

with Dominion machines) is 0.000000049, pointing to a statistical impossibility that this is a “random” statistical anomaly. Some external force caused this anomaly



11. To confirm that Dominion machines were the source of the pattern/anomaly, I conducted further analysis using propensity scoring using U.S. census variables (Including ethnicities, income, professions, population density and other social/economic data) , which was used to place counties into paired groups. Such an analysis is important because one concern could be that counties with Dominion systems are systematically different from their counterparts, so abnormalities in the margin for Biden are driven by other characteristics unrelated to the election.

12. After matching counties using propensity score analysis, the only difference between the groups was the presence of Dominion machines. This approach again showed a highly statistically significant difference between the two groups, with candidate Biden again averaging three percentage points higher in Dominion counties than in the associated paired county. The associated p-value is < 0.00005, against indicating a statistical impossibility that something unusual is not occurring involving Dominion machines.
13. The results of the analysis and the pattern seen in the included graph strongly suggest a systemic, system-wide algorithm was enacted by an outside agent, causing the results of Wisconsin's vote tallies to be inflated by somewhere between three and five point six percentage points. Statistical estimating yields that in Wisconsin, the best estimate of the number of impacted votes is 181,440. However, a 95% confidence interval calculation yields that as many as 236,520 votes may have been impacted.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the forgoing is true and correct.
Executed this November 28th, 2020.

,

/s/